

Attorney Docket No. 9022-30  
In re: Gupta et al.  
In re Serial No: 10/010,914  
Page 4 of 4

### REMARKS


Applicants appreciate the thorough examination of the present application as evidenced by the Office Action dated January 3, 2006 (hereinafter, the "Office Action").

Claims 29-31, 33, 34 and 36-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. *See* Office Action, page 2.

In response to the Office Action, Applicants have amended Claims 29, 31, 33 and 37 in view of the comments provided by the Examiner on pages 2 through 3 of the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 29-31, 33, 34 and 36-41 are compliant with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Shawna Cannon Lemon  
Registration No. 53,888

USPTO Customer No. 20792  
Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec, P.A.  
P. O. Box 37428  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27627  
Telephone: (919) 854-1400  
Facsimile: (919) 854-1401

### CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR § 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via facsimile number 571-273-8300 on March 23, 2006.

Susan E. Freedman

Date of Signature: March 23, 2006